DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES Public Health Service	FORM APPROVED: OMB No. 0937-0198 Expires: 12/21/99 See Statement of Burden on Back						
Annual Report on Possible Research Misconduct	Period Covered by this Report January 1, 1997 to December 31, 1997						
Please make changes in the space to the right:	INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIAL'S NAME						
+ ,	INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIAL'S TITLE						
,	NAME OF INSTITUTION						
Place mailing label here.	MAILING ADDRESS OF INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIAL						
·							
Section I. Administrative Policy							
Each institution which receives or applies for a PHS research, research-train	ning or research-related grant or cooperative agreement						
must have established an administrative policy for responding to allegations							
regulation (42 CFR Part 50, Subpart A) and certify that it will comply with t							
research under the jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).							
 Has your institution established the administrative policy for responding to allegations of research misconduct required by the PHS regulation? □ Yes □ No 							
If yes, on what date was the current administrative policy established?							
Section II. Types of Misconduct Activity Related to PHS App	plications and Awards						
A. PLEASE CHECK THE BOX (to the left) if your institution h inquiries or investigations of allegations during the reporting pe misconduct and (2) involve receipt of or requests for PHS funding Otherwise, please complete Section II.	riod that (1) fall under the PHS definition of research						
B. Please provide the requested information for each incident of alleged miscond fell within the PHS definition of research misconduct. Please note that, in acc reported to the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) before or immediately upon	cordance with section 50.103(d)(4), all investigations are to be						
PLEASE NOTE: For each incident of alleged research misconduct research investigation at your institution: (1) Identify the PHS source of funds (1R01CA12345-01); (2) the ORI case number, if assigned; (3) check the and/or investigation - may include more than one activity type for each of misconduct involved with each activity (may include more than one sheet if additional space or clarification is required.	(e.g. NIH/NCI) and the Grant Number (e.g. the type of activity (allegation, inquiry, an reported incident); and (4) check the type						
Do NOT include any alleged fiscal misconduct, human or animal subj regulated research.	ect abuses, conflicts of interest, or violations of FDA						

1.	Activity continued into 1997:							
		PHS Funding Source (include grant number and institute)	Office of Research Integrity Case Number, if assigned	Type of Activity	Type of Misconduct			
	Incident Number				Fabrication	Falsification	Plagiarism	Other Serious Deviations
	1.			□ Inquiry				
				□ Investigation				
	2.			□ Inquiry				
				□ Investigation				
	3.			□ Inquiry				
				□ Investigation				
2.	Activity beg	un in 1997:						
		PHS Funding Source (include grant number and institute)	Office of Research Integrity Case Number, if assigned	Type of Activity	Type of Misconduct			
	Incident Number				Fabrication	Falsification	Plagiarism	Other Serious Deviations
	1.			□ Allegation				
				□ Inquiry				
				□ Investigation				
	2.			□ Allegation				
				□ Inquiry				
				□ Investigation				
	3.			□ Allegation				
				□ Inquiry				
				□ Investigation				

PHS-6349 (Page 2 of 5) Rev. 11/97

In how many of the inquiries/investigations reported in reputation of the whistleblower?	B1 and/or B2, did your ins	stitution take affirma	tive steps to protect the	
Please indicate the reason(s) why steps were not taken to protect the position and reputation of the whistleblower. <i>Pleapply</i> .				
	Case #1	Case #2	Case #3	
No retaliation occurred				
Anonymous whistleblower				
Bad faith allegation				
Other (specify)				
Please indicate what efforts your institution did make to apply.	o protect the position and re	eputation of the whis	tleblower. Please chec	
Method	Case #1	Case #2	Case #3	
Protected complainant by maintaining confidentiality				
Established policy prohibiting retaliation				
Relocated complainant				
Protected employment of complainant				
Cautioned respondent against retaliating				
Monitored for possible retaliation				
Provided assistance to restore complainant's research program				
Established procedures for investigating allegations of retaliation				
Informed appropriate officials that the allegation was made in good faith				
Publicly acknowledged that the complainant did "the right thing"				
Imposed sanctions on retaliator(s)				
Reminded department chair and dean about protections afforded to complainants				
Other (specify):				

How many of the inquiries/investigations reported in B1 and/or B2 were still open on December 31, 1997? ____ F.

H.	In how many inquiries/investigations that did not support the allegation of research misconduct did your institution take affirmative steps trestore the reputation of the respondent?				
I.	Please indicate the reasons why steps were not taken to restore the reputation of the exonerated respondent. Please check as many a				
		Case #1	Case #2	Case #3	
	Reputation not damaged				
	Other institutional policies violated				
	Not wanted by respondent				
	Research quality inadequate				
	Poor supervisory practices				
	Breached confidentiality				
	Other (specify)				
					
J.	Please indicate what efforts your institution did make to resto	ore the reputation of exor	nerated individual.	. Please check as m	any as apply.
	Method	Case #1	Case #2	Case #3	
	Protected reputation by maintaining confidentiality				
	Removed material about allegation from personnel file	0			
	Sent letters to parties involved reporting no misconduct finding				
	Publicly announced exoneration				
	Other (specify):				
K.	For each finding of scientific misconduct in 1997, please state the saidentifiers in the descriptions below.	nctions imposed in each ca	se by the institution.	(Please do not includ	e any personal
	Number of misconduct findings in 1997				
	Sanctions:				
	Case 1:				
	Case 2:				
L.	For each bad faith allegation received, report the actions taken by the	e institution against the wh	istleblower, if any.		
	Number of bad faith allegations received in 1997				
	Allegation 1:				
	Allegation 2:				

How many of the inquiries/investigations reported in B1 and/or B2 did not support the allegation of research misconduct? ____

PHS-6349 (Page 4 of 5) Rev. 11/97

G.

Section III. Certification

Official certifying for institution:

NAME OF OFFICIAL (Please type)

TITLE

SIGNATURE

DATE

TELEPHONE NUMBER

()

INTERNET ADDRESS OF OFFICIAL:

STATEMENT OF BURDEN: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to: Reports Clearance Officer, PHS, Hubert H. Humphrey Building, Room 721-B, 200 Independence Avenue, S. W., Washington, D.C. 20201 (Attn: PRA) and to: Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0937-0198) Washington, D.C. 20502. *Please do not return this form to either of these addresses*.

RETURN THIS FORM TO: Assurance Program

Office of Research Integrity 5515 Security Lane, Suite 700

Rockville, MD 20852

Phone: (301) 443-5300 FAX: (301) 594-0042

E-Mail: CFLEISCHER@OSOPHS.DHHS.GOV

PHS-6349 (Page 5 of 5)

Rev. 11/97